The Honorable DW Christel Antoine D. Johnson, MD 1 P.O. Box #561 Aberdeen, Washington 98520 2 (360) 500-0122 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 5 AT TACOMA 6 UNITED STATES PROBATION AND | Case No. 3:21-cv-05125-JCC-DWC 7 PRETRIAL SERVICES (Custodian), 8 Respondent v. OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE ORDER. 9 ANTOINE D. JOHNSON, MD, (Re: Dkt. #23). Petitioner. 10 11 12 13 Magistrate Judge Christel violated the Priority of civil actions act. I. 14 Magistrate Judge Christel-15 16 "denie[d] the Motion (Dkt. #22) as premature...." 17 [Dkt. #23: p. 2; ln. 3]. 18 19 I OBJECT TO THAT DENIAL on the following grounds: 20 1. It is illogical, implausible, or without 21 support in the record. 22 [See Dkt. #10: p.4; lns. 13-14]. 23 2. It violates paragraph 'a' of the Priority of civil actions statute. 24 [See 28 USC 1657(a)]. 25 26 27 28 OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE ORDER. (RE: DKT. #23). - 1

"The Supreme Court has recognized that "[p]roblems of prematurity and abstractness may well present 'insuperable obstacles' to the exercise of the Court's jurisdiction, even though that jurisdiction is technically present."" (*In re Coleman*: 560 F.3d 1000, 1006; (9th Cir. 2009)).

Accordingly, the record here must contain a dismissal<sup>1</sup> or recommendation for dismissal to render exercise of 28 USC 1657(a), "premature for review because the injury is speculative and may never occur." (*Wolfson v. Brammer*, 616 F.3d 1045, 1057; 2010 (9th Cir.)). To my good, the record contains no dismissal or recommended dismissal of my Petition. (See Dkt. generally). Hence, my Motion (Dkt. #22), is akin to "cases that are appropriate for federal court action" under the ripeness doctrine. (Id.).

Because Magistrate Judge Christel-

"denie[d] the Motion (Dkt. #22) as premature...."

even though the record contains no dismissal or recommended dismissal of my Petition, such denial is "illogical, implausible, or without support in inferences that may be drawn from the record" (*U.S. v. Hinkson*, 585 F.3d 1247, 1263 (9th Cir. 2009)); and, violates paragraph 'a' of the *Priority of civil actions* statute (28 USC 1657(a))<sup>2</sup>

Dated this 24th day of June, 2021. Respectfully submitted by,

Antoine D. Johnson, MD

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "If the petition is not dismissed, the judge <u>must</u> order the respondent to file an answer, motion, or other response within a fixed time, or to take other action the judge may order." (Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases- Rule 4 in pertinent part only).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> I brought my Petition under Chapter 153 of Title 28. (See Dkt. #10: p.4; lns. 13-14). OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE ORDER, (RE: DKT. #23). - 2

Pro- Bot \$561 Aperacen WA (98520) WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA JUN 25 2021 RECEIVED LODGED

のならの一つのこののの

Section of the control of the contro

1717 Pacific Ave R= \$3100 Score, WA (98402-3200)

TACOMA WA 983 OLYMPIA WA 24 JUN 2021 PM 2 L

U.S. Orstoret Court

Wesdern District of Washington